

DD/A Registry  
87-1151X

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET				
SUBJECT: (Optional)				
FROM: C/CRD 322 Ames		EXTENSION	NO.	
			DATE 4 June 1987	
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED		
1. EXA/DDA 7D 10 Headquarters	05 JUN 1987	L/S	gr	<p>FYI</p> <p>2 to All:</p> <p>When the report is received from the consultants (mid-June per Ken) I believe it should be reviewed by <u>all</u> Directorate representatives. Then we should <u>all</u> meet including Ken and Stan to discuss and determine what changes, if any, need to be made in the program.</p> <p>CEM</p> <div></div>
2. DA/IRO	6 June 87		em	
3. <del>DDA/Registry</del>				
4. ADDA	10 JUN 1987		W	
5. DDA	09 JUN 1987		W	
6.				
7. Registry - FILE				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

ADMINISTRATIVE--INTERNAL USE ONLY

87-1151X

1 June 1987

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Historical Review Program Consultants' Meeting, 20 May 1987

STAT 1. At the end of their discussions on 20 May, the panel of five consultants met with the Chief of CRD and me, to outline the comments and recommendations that they proposed to include in their report. As in 1985, [redacted] will draft the report and circulate it for the panel's approval. We can expect to get the report by about mid-June.

2. I'll note below the gist of their recommendations, along with the steps that the History Staff should take to help carry them out.

3. Exclusion of "Pre-decisional" Files. The consultants (and I) were surprised to hear that the Historical Review Branch (HRB) is withholding material from declassification on the basis of a guideline evidently inspired by the FOIA (b)(5) exclusion of "pre-decisional" documents. The panel questioned whether in a voluntary systematic review program the Agency should withhold such records as the minutes of the DCI's morning meetings as "privileged" material. Clearly such a blanket policy could exclude vast amounts of otherwise declassifiable material, of the sort that all other Federal agencies routinely declassify. (Dr. Slany, the State Department Historian, noted that State claimed no such "privilege" in the systematic declassification of their records, and Mr. Thompson, Director of NARA's Records Declassification Division, noted that to his knowledge no other Federal agency made such a claim in the systematic review of records.) To get at the root of this, the History Staff should:

A. Find the origins of this HRB guideline.

B. Determine whether such a guideline is justifiable.

C. If the guideline is not justifiable, we should look at those records (e.g. the DCI files, 1945-55) that HRB has already reviewed, to see whether they should be reviewed again under revised guidelines.

In any case, the History Staff should go over all the declassification guidelines with HRB, and take an active role in formulating the declassification guidelines that HRB reviewers use.

ADMINISTRATIVE--INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE--INTERNAL USE ONLY

4. Priority of Records for Review. The panel found that the 500 feet of U-2 records now being reviewed are of limited historical value, and should not be given priority for review. (Professor Gaddis noted that these records, principally of the U-2 development program, do not have the information about the photos the U-2 took, and the policymakers' use of them, which would most interest historians.) Review of the U-2 collection should therefore be set aside indefinitely. The panel also held that the so-called "Murphy Collection" should have very low--if any--priority for review, and suggested that it might well be returned for review to the Department of State, where it originated.

To work out priorities for records review, the panel recommended that the Historical Review Program should be guided by the list of 1945-1950 records that the State Department History Office has requested for their projected supplementary FRUS volumes.

To rearrange priorities for records review, the History Staff should:

- A. Consult with the State Department History Office to determine the groups of records they would like.
- B. Take steps to find these record groups at the Records Center.
- C. Advise the CRD on priorities for reviewing these records.

5. Sanitizing. In general the panel found the HRB's sanitizing procedures sound. They questioned two specific policies, however: the excising (or blacking out) of all classification markings so that the original level cannot be determined; and the deletion of the names of all Agency employees (except for a few of the very top officers). To clarify these questions, the History Staff should:

- A. Inquire into policy and practice in CIA, and elsewhere in the Intelligence Community, with respect to the total deletion of previous classification markings.
- B. Inquire into the legal basis, policy and practice in CIA of withholding former overt employees' names in declassifying records.
- C. Work with CRD to write consistent and defensible policy guidelines for both questions.

6. Officially Released Information. The panel recommended that for each group of records selected for review, the History Staff should provide HRB reviewers as much guidance as possible on relevant information that has already been declassified and officially released.

7. Review of Declassification Results. The panel recommended that as the HRB reviews a group of records, the History Staff should examine the

ADMINISTRATIVE--INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE--INTERNAL USE ONLY

material that is to be withheld as well as the material proposed for release. The panel recommended that CRD should consult the History Staff before destroying any records under review, and suggested that the History Staff should examine the SSU field reports that the Chief of HRB noted were to be destroyed.

8. Permanent Advisory Group. The panel recommended that they, or some comparable group, return to consult on the Historical Review Program at regular intervals, but no more often than every two years. In the intervening years, they recommended that the Agency should send the advisory group an annual report, along the lines of the report they received before this meeting.

9. FRUS Cooperation. The panel was satisfied with the program's cooperation with the Department of State History Office in the projected supplementary volumes to the FRUS.

10. Records Preservation. The panel was satisfied with the Agency's program to insure the physical preservation of records.

STAT

  
J. Kenneth McDonald  
Chief, DCI History Staff

tribution:

- 1 - HS Subject (Historical Review Program)
- 1 - HS Chrono
- 1 - Executive Secretary
- 1 ea Members History Staff
- 1 - C/CRD

ADMINISTRATIVE--INTERNAL USE ONLY